



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DR. HAMMOND'S ESTIMATE OF WOMAN.

MRS. BLAKE.

AN attentive perusal of the somewhat rambling essay on "Woman in Politics," prepared by Dr. Wm. A. Hammond, discloses a looseness of argument and incorrectness of statement surprising in one who so stoutly contends for scientific accuracy in others. Thus, after admitting and, to a certain extent, approving the progress of the movement for woman's advancement, this learned opponent of its further success would arrest "the revolution," because she has already secured sundry advantages which, any well informed person should be aware, are still far beyond her reach. He says: "Her right to work in any field of labor she may select is granted; her person and property are as well protected by law as those of man; she has all the rights and privileges necessary for her material and mental prosperity."

A brief analysis of this remarkable series of assumptions will show its incorrectness. The right of woman to work in many fields of labor is denied or restricted. She cannot hold any of the higher positions in the civil service of the country. She cannot fill any of the legislative or executive offices of the Government. She cannot occupy a seat on the judges' bench, and is not even admitted to the bar in New York and many other States, while in innumerable professions and avocations her sex is made a reason for refusing to her equal advantages. Her person and property are not as well protected as man's. Women are in all cities liable to arrest for walking the streets after dark, while the peculiar protection to which their sex should entitle them is everywhere so inadequate that the columns of our journals are daily darkened with shocking stories of outrage on women. As to property, Dr. Hammond must know that, though in several of the new States and a few of the

old ones, women have been secured in property rights, still, in nearly all the Middle and Southern States, and even in some of the New England States, married women can neither inherit nor otherwise acquire property, and are not protected even in their earnings, while the right which, above all others, should belong to the mother—the right to her own children—is denied even in New York. And finally, it cannot be declared that woman “has all the privileges necessary for her material and mental prosperity,” while her wages are everywhere from one-half to one-third less than those paid to men for the same work, and admission to nearly all the higher universities is denied to her.

A still more glaring instance of inaccuracy and want of information on the part of the distinguished physician is displayed in his extraordinary assertion that life insurance companies decline to issue policies to women. There is apparently no shadow of foundation for this statement. Very soon after its appearance, its truth was investigated by some of the newspapers, and it was easily ascertained that insurance companies do issue policies to women, only charging them a trifling additional annual premium if they are under forty-five years of age.

In the opinion of Dr. Hammond, exactness of statement is peculiarly a masculine characteristic, while one of the strongest proofs of woman's inferiority and consequent unfitness for any share in politics is, that “she does not, while having an abhorrence of falsehood, understand the necessity for being exact in the ordinary affairs of every-day life.”

Apparently, all the men the good physician has ever met were models of truthfulness and scrupulously exact in their statements. If exactness in the ordinary affairs of life is to be a requisite for admission to the right of suffrage, how many voters will there be at the next general election? Will Wall street be represented? How many merchants will dare to come? Will any political organization send a delegation? Hardly, if there has been the usual estimate of majorities and predictions of party success. And even the worthy Doctor himself will certainly not attempt to show himself at the polls after that unfortunate inexactness in regard to life insurance. Indeed, were men judged by the standard to which he holds women, it would be hard to find the ten righteous souls that should save the city.

But the main stress and force of the Doctor's argument that women ought not to be admitted to political privileges is to be

found in his elaborate comparison of the differences in weight, form, and convolutions between the male and female brain, and the deduction that because of these differences women must not be allowed to vote. No doubt the eminent anatomist is as exact in the facts and figures here given, as the most rigid truthfulness would demand; we would not venture to question the statements of so distinguished a specialist in a department so peculiarly his own, but merely ask if, admitting his premises, his conclusions are therefore correct.

His argument rests upon the statement that the average male brain weighs forty-nine ounces, while the average female brain weighs only forty-four ounces, although he admits that, "relatively to the weight of the body in the two sexes, there is no essential difference in the weight of brain"; and that the female brain differs from the male in structure, the latter having a superior development of the frontal lobes, more intricate convolutions, deeper sulci, and more numerous secondary fissures,—all of these things being assumed to indicate higher mental development, though of course this is mere inference. And, when the assertion is added that "woman's brain is not suited to the work which is required of man," one is tempted to ask how, then, it is that women employed as journalists, teachers, telegraphers, stenographers, type-setters, and in a vast number of other occupations, acquit themselves as well or better than their male competitors?

The Doctor fails to note one point which seems to have some bearing on the question of functional activity, and this is, that, according to Broca, when a man has less than thirty-nine ounces of brain he is an idiot, while a woman is competent to attend to the ordinary duties of life, and may be a useful citizen unless she has less than thirty-two ounces of brain. Surely, this significant fact would seem to indicate that there is in the larger brain of man a want of compactness, and that, relatively, his brain is less capable of control than woman's. Possibly this may account for the frequent masculine tendency toward looseness of conduct and irregularity of morals, and explain why so large a number of our present voters seem to be but little removed from idiocy.

However, admitting the truth of all the Doctor's assertions, the whole force of his deductions from the difference of size and form of brain between woman and man is destroyed by the ad-

mission which he makes, that "it is quite true that the brains of some women are larger than those of some men, just as some women are vastly superior, mentally, to some men." If this be so, then the whole argument that women ought not to vote, because they have smaller brains than men, ceases to be of the slightest value, since, if political privileges are to be regulated by weight of brain, then of course women should have equal privileges with men whose brain power only equals theirs, and superior privileges to those of men whose brains are inferior to theirs in capacity.

But feeling, no doubt, that mere deficiency of volume of brain is not sufficient to stamp women as light-weights mentally, he endeavors to prove their unfitness for political life by a variety of general deductions. He says: "The best wife, the best mother, the best sister, would inevitably make the worst legislator, the worst judge, the worst commander of a man-of-war,"—a hasty assumption which it is easy to make, considering that, from the universal masculine usurpation of all the best positions, we have very few data to prove what women would be in commanding positions. We know, however, that Deborah, the great lawgiver of Israel, and Maria Theresa, the valiant Empress of Austria, were both good wives and excellent administrators; while, as a rule, men who have been conspicuous for their ability as legislators, judges, and commanders, have been notoriously bad husbands and fathers, from Socrates to Lord Nelson.

Again, the Doctor declares that in women the emotional nature predominates over the intellectual,—a hasty generalization to which any one's circle of acquaintance will offer exceptions,—and asserts that to this is due the fact that "very few women are capable of an intense degree of abstract thought." As this is equally true of his own sex (and very few men "are capable of an intense degree of abstract thought"), no important deduction is possible from so universal a failing.

Further, he says that woman is inferior because "she will sacrifice her own happiness, her life, and all considerations of duty to others and the public at large, for some man whom she loves." But as the records of human life prove that man, under the sway of passion, will sacrifice everything to the woman he loves, the statement amounts to nothing more than a truism with regard to both sexes; and similarly when he argues that women, if acting as judges and jurors, would be influenced by sympathy with

a handsome felon, he only asserts that they would be as weak as men occupying similar positions, who are notoriously lenient to beautiful female culprits.

"The female mind," he contends, "experiences overwhelming difficulties in the study of mathematics,"—a very singular statement in view of the fact that within the last few years mathematical honors at the universities of Edinburgh, Cambridge, and London have been won by women; and that the average mathematical attainments of the girls in the normal colleges is above that of the boys in our high schools.

Again, the brilliant instance of woman's capacity for the most difficult mathematical calculations, displayed by Mrs. Roeb-ling in the important part she played in the building of the Brooklyn Bridge, disposes of the Doctor's sneer that the female brain is incapable of grappling with the problems involved in the construction of suspension bridges, and makes the silly comparison between a mathematical woman and a tipsy hare a mere gratuitous impertinence.

But, like a good general, reserving what he doubtless considers his most powerful battalions of argument for the close of the battle, the great specialist attempts finally to annihilate all woman's aspirations for personal liberty by dwelling at considerable length on the "peculiar neurotic condition called the hysterical, which is grafted on the organization of woman." He declares that, while this "is the cause of all the most charming features in her character," it also makes her peculiarly susceptible to extraordinary excitement, and that therefore she should not be intrusted with political power.

It is evident that the distinguished alienist, in his estimate of woman's powers and capacities, is largely influenced by the studies of dementia and hysteria, to which he has devoted a large portion of his life. His acquaintance with normal and healthy women must be limited, or he would have considered how many wives and mothers daily meet circumstances which require discretion with admirable capacity, and how that in scenes of public danger the presence of mind displayed by women has often put to shame the cowardice exhibited by men.

However, the argument against woman's admission to politics, drawn from her emotional nature, if it proves anything at all proves entirely too much. If liability to excitement unfits her for positions in which "force of intellect, power of disinterested

judgment, and large views of public policy are concerned," what shall be said of her brother man's capacity? Assuredly the members of that sex are also "at any moment, and often from slight causes, liable to burst out into unexpected and uncontrollable paroxysms, in which all the mental and physical faculties are perverted from their normal course and thrown into a condition of most astounding turbulence," as will be admitted by any spectator of the recent prize fight in Madison Square Garden, where learned professors, grave statesmen, and distinguished jurists shouted and swayed in wild excitement over the blows exchanged by two brutal giants. Many a quiet wife could bear similar testimony to masculine proneness to undue violence from causes no more momentous than the annual house-cleaning.

Certainly, any one who has ever been present at a Presidential nominating convention and seen men, under the excitement of the moment, howling, screaming, weeping, tearing off their clothing to throw it in the air, and utterly exhausting themselves by the violence of their emotions, might well declare that in every man "there is a potentiality for irregular, illogical, incongruous, and altogether inharmonious conduct under circumstances which require the utmost degree of presence of mind and discretion." In view of scenes like these, the calm observer, if non-professional, might well suppose that, despite the physiological differences, men were also subject to "the peculiar neurotic condition called the hysterical."

In fact, after comparing the conduct and attributes of the two sexes, "extenuating naught, neither setting down aught in malice," to be consistent, the Doctor must either declare men unfit for politics, or admit that, since he himself has said that women excel in conscientiousness, truthfulness, and intuition, these qualities should be represented in government as an offset to the folly and unreason which so often sway our present voters.

Briefly stated, the whole essay amounts to little more than the assertion that women must not vote because they are women — a begging of the question hardly worthy of so severe a critic. In conclusion, we cannot do better than to quote the words of a scientific writer as distinguished as Dr. Hammond. Prof. Huxley, in discussing the same question, while candidly admitting the disabilities of sex, says :

"We fear that, so long as this potential motherhood is her lot, woman will be found to be fearfully weighted in the battle of life. The duty of man is to see that not a grain is piled upon that load beyond what nature imposes; that injustice is not added to inequality."

LILLIE DEVEREUX BLAKE.

MISS MORAIS.

IF Macaulay's New Zealander, sitting upon a broken pier of the Brooklyn bridge in some future age, should take up a copy of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* for August, 1883, he might reasonably infer that the wearing of long hair, or short hair, or hair parted in the middle or on the side, bore some occult though direct relation to the profoundest sociological problems of our times. It is indeed true that any departure from the reigning fashion of wearing the hair has for many ages denoted the social barbarian; and the length or the cut of the coat of a reformer is to many minds the gauge of the propriety of his reform.

But Dr. Hammond, in his appeal to popular prejudice, may be contradicted at the outset. He states that the Woman Suffrage movement was at first conducted by abnormally constituted men and women, who respectively displayed longings for the clothing and characteristics of the opposite sex. He declares that these beings were universally regarded as a "set of impracticable fanatics," who, being "unhappy in their domestic relations," tried "to make their fellow-creatures as miserable as they were themselves." He asserts that the first proceedings of the "suffragists" displayed the effects of that peculiar neurotic condition called the hysterical, which, according to the Doctor, is a normal state of the female organism. In reply to criticisms of this order, H. B. Blackwell, of the "*Woman's Journal*," whose authority on the subject is beyond question, names the prominent men and women who took part in the movement or expressed sympathy with it in its earliest days. Some of the "effeminate" men were Ralph Waldo Emerson, William Lloyd Garrison, Bronson Alcott, John G. Whittier, George W. Curtis, T. W. Higginson, and Wendell Phillips. Some of the "abnormally constituted" women were Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone,

Antoinette Brown. Many of these men and women were happy husbands and wives; most of them have exercised beneficial influences on American life and thought; and their fanaticism was effective enough to aid in erasing forever the sarcasm that made our national hymn celebrate "The land of the free and the home of the *slave*."

Moreover, the records of the first suffrage meetings have been carefully preserved, and, bearing in mind the contumely heaped upon the characters and motives of the participants, their papers are singularly calm and dignified. Indeed, the pioneers of the agitation appreciated full well that only by irreproachable demeanor and persistent appeals to the popular sense of justice could even a primary hearing be obtained.

The movement for woman suffrage was not an hysterical outburst of abolition notions, but the expression of a long germinating idea, which the war times brought prematurely into prominence. The French Revolution had not fired the hearts of men without sending a spark into the breasts of the mothers of men. Mary Wollstonecraft, the first vindicator of the rights of woman, dedicated to Talleyrand the work which strove to impress upon women the beauty of physical health and moral purity, and which enjoined upon them to spurn the courtesy that called them admirable because of their weakness. Since the time of Mary Shelley's beautiful mother, many gifted women—among whom were the gentle sister of Elia, and our own sweet singers Alice and Phœbe Cary—have spoken as boldly as they dared on behalf of their sex; but not until the days of the antislavery agitation was any organization attempted to promote their ideas. At that time women, whose influence by pen and by tongue had formed a large if not a preponderant factor in the triumph of abolition principles, were appointed as delegates to abolition meetings, but were refused the right to vote in a cause for which they had worked so earnestly and so effectively. "You may fill our ranks by your songs and your books; you may sacrifice health, time, means, for the cause in which we are engaged; but you cannot comprehend the issue involved, and even if you did, the act of voting would unsex you." This was the logic of the anti-suffragists during the war; against this logic the "impracticable fanatics" rebelled.

Such was the origin of the Woman Suffrage movement.

Its results thus far, as summarized by Dr. Hammond, may be briefly stated thus: The "spirit of fairness" (evoked by this disreputable agitation) has allowed woman to earn her own livelihood in almost any field she may choose, has permitted her to keep her own property, and has given her a qualified suffrage in some States. But now that the "spirit of fairness" has granted all this, Dr. Hammond cries Halt! The revolution must not only be arrested, but, "contrary to the ordinary course of procedure in other revolutions, must go backward." For "grave anatomical and physiological reasons," the law of social progress must be reversed. In what particulars the "spirit of fairness" has gone too far, Dr. Hammond does not mention. It may be inferred, however, that the hysterical being who can reason neither exactly nor abstractly, nor without prejudice, is unfit to perform any serious business of life unless under constant supervision. Yet, in the Doctor's opinion, the very absence of rationality fits woman preëminently for the most solemn and responsible of all duties — those of the mother.

To consider Dr. Hammond's "grave anatomical and physiological reasons" for reversing the progress of civilization is to pursue a path oft trodden, and hence wearisome to those who have given any thought to the question here debated. Unfortunately, the reiterated words of the best expositors of the movement, like the condemnation of the absentees in the pastor's sermon, reach only the ears of those already convinced. Briefly, the facts and arguments of Dr. Hammond's school are these: The average brain-weight of man is universally admitted to be greater than that of woman, and, according to the *ex cathedra* utterances of Dr. Hammond, the brain of man is of finer quality than that of woman. In many instances, large brains have been more productive than small ones. It follows from these data, that women cannot reason as well as men, and ought, therefore, not to vote. Now, the thinker will see at once a number of breaks in this chain of reasoning. The first query that suggests itself may be stated thus: Can it be shown that large brains are so often coincident with superior intellectuality as to make the possessor of a large mind and a small brain exceptional? The answer is that it cannot. Again: Is the knowledge of the structure of the brain so well defined that mental capacity may be deduced strictly from a consideration of that structure? The answer is, that it is not. And further: In the absence of such knowledge, has there

ever been any fair test made of the relative mental capacities of male and female? The answer is, that until lately there has been no attempt at a like educational development of the sexes; that the attempt has been made, not by physiologists as a class, but in spite of them; and that the results, notwithstanding all inherited and natural disadvantages on the female side, show an equal progress of the girl and the boy. And, collaterally, it may be well to emphasize the oft-repeated fact, uncontradicted by physiologists, that a man with less than thirty-seven ounces of brain matter is an idiot, while a woman—with a brain of inferior quality, according to Dr. Hammond—is fairly intelligent with thirty-two ounces.

Finally, and of most importance in this discussion, is the question, What relation does the higher mental capacity bear to the right or privilege of voting? Is there any country in the world in which the power of abstract reasoning or the ability to grasp generalities is a test for qualification at the polls? Across the Atlantic, the angle of political capacity spreads from the Russian autocrat at the apex to the holders of the "lodger franchise" on English soil. At one time wealth, at another genealogy, at another religion, has been made the test of the voter; but at no time has the power of abstract reasoning been set up as a necessary condition for the exercise of the highest function of citizenship. Indeed, if an exclusion from the suffrage were made on this ground, and if it were applied, as it ought to be in justice, to both men and women, the polling list would be more than doubly decimated; but no government with such a franchise could, by any stretch of the imagination, be called representative. The most profound thinkers are not always the best fitted to comprehend and to legislate for the wants of those less highly endowed, and the vote of the illiterate laborer is as necessary for the protection of his interests as that of the cultured monopolist is for the broader schemes which accumulated wealth suggests. The votes of both classes, and, indeed, of all classes, are of equal necessity for the well-being of a government which proposes to represent the will, not of a clique, but of the people. In the broadest view, government exists only as the representative of the governed; it is the expression of the will of all classes, and when any class is excluded from the franchise, just and weighty reasons for such exclusion must be shown.

By what process of reasoning are native women over twenty-one years of age debarred, in this country, from the right extended in general to every male of full age who is not an idiot, a pauper, a criminal, or an unnaturalized foreigner? Is woman so incapable of comprehending her own interests as to make her enforced silence necessary for her own welfare? Is her nature and her function in life so like that of man as to need no distinct representation? Or has she been represented vicariously by her male relatives? Dr. Hammond says that woman is incapable of comprehending her own interests. The teacher whose lessons have the largest influence on the character of our legislators cannot understand what constitutes her own advantage. Her hysterical nature, led astray by neurotic impulses, incapable of forming unbiased judgments, may properly sway the new generation, but cannot control itself; and yet the good mothers of the race exemplify the fact that in the one case in which feeling is most dominant—in the love of mother for child—the educator has allowed not emotion but judgment to sway her conduct; and further, if more women than men are hysterical and frivolous, let it be remembered that the “lady” has always been shielded from the necessity of deciding the serious issues of life, the confronting of which serves to mature the character.

To the second query, Is woman's point of view so like man's that she needs no special representation, the reply is obvious. Woman is so unlike man in her physical, mental, and social nature that she needs preëminently a special representation.

Thirdly, has she been represented vicariously? The common and statute law which allowed her husband the control of her private property, which gave her separate earnings to a drunken husband, which declared that upon her husband's death she was not the natural guardian of her children, offers speaking examples of the so-called vicarious representation. That many wrongs have been righted without the influence of the ballot is due to the much denounced agitation which has addressed itself to men's “spirit of fairness,” and to the obvious need of silencing the demand for the suffrage by remedying the most glaring evils which the denial of that right entailed.

The suffragists of the United States have met with the usual derision and maltreatment that await reformers. The fair name of their women has been defamed, the actions of the

men misrepresented. It is true that now and then some seeker for notoriety, some loud-voiced advocate of liberty for lawless purposes, has thrust himself or herself into the ranks; but the body of suffragists are, and have been, men and women known for the spotless purity of their lives, and for an unfaltering purpose in promoting what they believe to be a sacred cause.

The status of the Woman Suffrage movement is simply this: It asserts the primary right of every human being not obviously incapable of appreciating his own interests—and hence, indirectly, the interests of society—to a voice in his own government. It denies to any one the right of presenting an *a priori* case against woman's capacity, holding that brain structures are not reliable standards of qualifications for voting, and that all fair trials of mental endowments, thus far, have shown that the mind of the girl is as good as that of the boy. It affirms that taxation and representation are inseparable, and claims that women who pay both direct and indirect taxes are entitled to the same civil rights and privileges that the men of the Revolution demanded from the stubborn king who claimed to know what was best for the interest of his refractory subjects.

The Woman Suffrage movement declares that all the issues involved in the right of men to vote, and all the powers dependent upon it, are of equally profound importance to women. If the ballot is the scepter of kingship which dignifies man with a noble responsibility, it is no less to her who must teach him the moral duties entailed by that responsibility. She may make mistakes in the exercise of her new prerogative, but in the wider field of activity to which she is called she will gain the kind of culture that will enable her to become a better, because a more clear-sighted, mother. The suffragists hope that the same refinement that has been noted in all public movements, in which men and women work conjointly, will purify the political meeting and the ballot-box. The example of Wyoming encourages them in this hope. They demand that woman shall have equal (some think, coördinate) facilities with man in preparing for and pursuing any calling she may choose. Not restriction, but competition, will determine the sphere of every human worker.

Finally, the suffrage party endeavors to purify marriage and ennoble motherhood, by insisting that a liberal education and liberal opportunities for gaining a livelihood shall prevent marriages that are not unions of respect and affection. It resents

as an insult the insinuation that women are becoming too finical as regards the qualifications of husbands, and that the alternative of womanhood is to marry or to starve. It directs attention to the means for preserving physical health, and lays the axe at the root of social immorality.

Such is the status of the revolution which "ought to turn backward."

NINA MORAIS.

MRS. UNDERWOOD.

IN an article in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for August, Dr. Hammond gives what he calls "grave anatomical and physiological reasons" why woman's desire for "unrestricted suffrage" and expectation of "holding political office" should be disregarded, and also why the limited suffrage she already possesses should be taken from her. As he expresses it, "contrary to the course of procedure in other revolutions, this one should go backward."

The first of these "grave anatomical and physiological reasons" we find to be the oft-stated one that "the brain of man is larger than that of woman." Would not this argument apply to man against man as well? If so, how will Dr. Hammond explain such instances as the following, which are by no means uncommon?

"Dr. Haldemann reports, in the 'Cincinnati Lancet' and the 'Popular Science Monthly,' that the brain of a mulatto who died lately at Columbus, Ohio, weighed 68¾ ounces, or nearly 5 ounces more than that of Cuvier. The man was 'illiterate, and not very intelligent.' The latter journal mentions also the case of a bricklayer, whose brain weighed 67 ounces, but who could neither read nor write."

That the Doctor believes in the exploded theory of brain-weight determining the amount of intelligence in individuals is further shown by his attempt to explain the superiority of some women in his admission that "the brains of some women are larger than those of some men, just as some women are vastly superior mentally to some men"; but he fails to show that the particular women whose brains are larger than some men's are the women who are mentally superior to the men whose brains weigh less than theirs. In another phase of the brain question he seems to think he has found a stronger proof against woman's

intellectual possibilities. "The female brain," he avers, "is not only smaller than that of man but is different in structure, and this fact involves much more as regards the character of the mental faculties than does the element of size." To this we will let Dr. Louis Büchner, the widely known German physicist and author, reply. He says:

"The smaller stature and weaker muscular development of woman, as well as the smaller diameter of the nervous threads which converge in the central parts of the nervous system, quite naturally cause the total mass of the female brain to be comparatively smaller, without necessarily causing the development of energy of the parts of the brain devoted to the intellectual functions to suffer. In the second place, even if it could be demonstrated that these parts remain in their development behind those of man, this may just as well be ascribed to defective exercise and cultivation as to an original deficiency. For it is well known that every organ of the body, and therefore also the brain, requires for its full development, and consequently for the development of its complete capability of performance, exercise and persistent effort. That this is and has been the case for thousands of years in a far less degree in woman than in man, in consequence of her defective training and education, will be denied by no one. . . . Finally, in confuting this objection, a point must not be forgotten, to which attention cannot be too often called, namely, that the estimation of the intellectual value of a brain depends not merely upon its size or material bulk, but equally, if not even more, upon its internal constitution and the finer development of its individual parts, and that it is perfectly conceivable that the female brain as regards this fineness, and in accordance with the greater fineness and delicacy of the female body generally, may exceed the male brain in the same proportion as the latter exceeds the female brain in its development in size."—"Büchner's Man in the Past, Present, and Future," pp. 205-207.

We refer Dr. Hammond also to the discussion on this point between the eminent German anatomists and physiologists, Biscoff and Bruehl, the first of whom took Dr. Hammond's position, while Dr. Bruehl denied that any anatomist had yet been able to determine the sex of a brain from the configuration of its convolutions.

But the supreme obstacle to woman's pretensions to the franchise the Doctor finds in "a peculiar neurotic condition, called the hysterical, which is ingrafted on the organization of woman," which is "the result of the advanced development of the emotional part of her nervous system," and which "is at any moment, and often from slight causes, liable to burst out into unexpected and uncontrollable paroxysms in which all the mental and physical faculties are perverted from their normal course of action

and thrown into a condition of the most astonishing turbulence," and therefore "entirely unfits her for emergencies, or difficult situations in general." That women, by reason of the conditions under which they have been held in the past, are more prone than men to nervous excitement is true, but it is not true that these nervous tendencies have been developed to the extent claimed by Dr. Hammond, nor would those tendencies have any appreciable effect on woman's political opinion or action. In all the most perilous crises of life, common to men and women alike, women have been found as likely to act with dignity, sound judgment, and promptness as men.

"A strong point in the mentality of woman," Dr. Hammond concedes, "consists in her intuitions. . . . She will often 'jump' at a correct conclusion with a wonderful degree of promptness and accuracy, which reason would reach with slowness and difficulty, if at all"; but he confesses that he perceives "nothing intellectual about the process," which confession marks the limitations of Dr. Hammond's knowledge of what intuition really is. Those who have studied intuition the most closely are agreed that it is experiential in its origin, and dependent for its existence primarily upon those slower intellectual processes commonly called reasoning. Intuition is judgment wherein "the relations seem to embody experiences which are not specified, or cannot now be specified, although originally they were capable of being so." It is experiential in the race but connate in the individual, and strong as an aptitude in those directions in which the reasoning powers for centuries have been continually exercised; for instance, in women, those demanding insight into motives and character. Says G. H. Lewes, than whom none have given this subject more careful study:

"Intuition under its ideal aspect is judgment. . . . The conclusion which is seen so rapidly that its premises are but faintly or not at all recognized, is said to be seen intuitively; it is an organized judgment. . . . In the perception of an object we are unconscious of the many evanescent muscular feelings by which its distance is estimated and its shape inferred. These relations are intuited, and because the judgments are so rapid and so inevitable, we regard the perception of distance and the shape of the object as given in an immediate apprehension. Analysis, however, discloses that the evanescent processes of which we are unconscious must have taken place, and in the early days of experience the processes took place slowly, consciously. All our other intuitions are organized experiences, groups of neural processes which originally were isolated."

Thus the intuitions of woman cannot be so unintellectual in their nature as Dr. Hammond would have us think.

Another of the "grave anatomical and physiological reasons" which forbid women meddling with politics, according to Dr. Hammond, is her incapacity for mathematical studies, which he thus states :

"It is owing to this difficulty of being exact that the female mind experiences overwhelming obstacles in the study of mathematics. It is not a matter for surprise that the school-girl, under the idea that she must pursue the same course of study which experience has shown to be most advantageous for boys, suffers with headache and other symptoms of disordered cerebral action when she ventures into the domain of spherical trigonometry and the differential calculus."

In astronomy, a science largely based on a thorough knowledge of the higher mathematics, three women in recent times have made their names memorable through their high attainments and discoveries. Their mathematical studies evidently did not injure their health or cause any "symptoms of disordered cerebral action," for they were women of exceptional health and longevity. Mrs. Somerville died at the age of ninety-one years and eleven months, and was active in mind and body up to the day of her death; Caroline Herschel lived to be nearly ninety-eight, with all her mental faculties unimpaired; Maria Mitchell is now sixty-five years old, and until within the last two or three years never knew a sick day; while hundreds of other women are to-day engaged in mathematical studies as severe as those of any male students, and with no more consequent evidence of "disordered cerebral action"; Professor Laughlin, Professor of Political Economy in Harvard, says, in regard to the students of the Harvard "Annex":

"The first year of the establishment of the plan for the collegiate instruction of women the largest single course fell to me as instructor in political economy. To six ladies I gave a course identical with that followed by one hundred and eight under-graduates, chiefly from the Junior and Senior classes of Harvard, so that it was natural for me to make comparisons in regard to results. So far as marks signify anything, those received by this class of ladies, graded on the same scale with the young men, were somewhat higher for the former than for the latter. And I may add that the courses in political economy are regarded by under-graduates in college as among the most difficult in the curriculum."

Dr. Hammond clinches his argument as to the inexactitude of women by the statement that on this account "life insurance companies decline to issue policies to her. For the like reason many corporations which loan money will not lend to women, though the securities be as good as gold itself." To say nothing of the inconsistency of the statement that corporations will not lend to any one when the securities are "as good as gold," the assertion in regard to insurance companies can be abundantly disproved, the Equitable Insurance Company, for instance, having thousands of women among its policy-holders; and the only cases in which higher rates are demanded from women than from men are those during the child-bearing period, and then not on account of woman's "inexactness," but because of the greater risk to life during those years; and those rates are no higher than are demanded of men who follow precarious occupations, as sailors, commercial travelers, or railroad men.

Dr. Hammond declares that women are "entirely wanting in that type of mental organization known as the 'judicial mind.'" Also, that, although there are certain offices "of a clerical and routine character," for which the sex is fitted, yet "those in which force of intellect, a power of disinterested judgment, and enlarged views of public policy are required must ever continue to be occupied by man." No position can test more seriously these qualities than the governmental power possessed by the rulers of nations. The law of primogeniture in monarchical nations has in certain instances forced upon women this power. To accord with Dr. Hammond's theory, the reigns of queens and empresses should have proved more disastrous to the interests of their respective nations than those of kings and emperors, for in no case could there be any choice of women of exceptional ability to fill positions determined only by ties of consanguinity and priority of birth. Of the four queens who have ruled England, none were weak-minded or vacillating, and the reigns of Elizabeth and Victoria form two of the most splendid epochs of English history. Five of Russia's sovereigns have been women. One of these was Olga, surnamed "the Wise"; Catherine, the widow of Peter the Great, a charming and brilliant woman, was called "the Russian Aspasia"; and Catherine II., though headstrong and somewhat cruel and vicious, was a woman of great intellect and the liberal patron of science, art, and literature; under her rule Russia made prodigious progress. In 1338,

Margaret, Queen of Sweden, styled by historians "the Semiramis of the North," by her warlike prowess and wise policy, united for the first time Sweden, Denmark, and Norway under one government, of which she was the head, and which she raised to a high pitch of glory. To the liberality of thought and purse of Isabella of Spain is due the discovery of this continent, while no German monarch accomplished more for the honor and glory of his country and people than Maria Theresa of Austria. If we turn back to an earlier period of history, we find record of the brilliant reigns and noble deeds of Boadicea, Semiramis, and Dido; while even among the Jews, Deborah, a prophetess, was made one of the ruling judges of Israel because of her wisdom; and it was to the tact of a Jewish queen that the race once owed its salvation. And yet Dr. Hammond, on the strength of his "anatomical and physiological" reasons, would have us believe that women are "entirely wanting in that type of organization known as the 'judicial mind.'"

Having proved, as he thinks, that women are lacking in the "judicial mind," he owns that the franchise ought to "carry with it the right to hold any office" for which they "have the privilege of voting"; and since, in his opinion, women are not fit to hold political offices, they should therefore not be allowed to vote. Even admitting the truth of his theory in regard to the incompetence of women to hold office, Dr. Hammond's argument does not hold good. Every male voter, no matter how ignorant, besotted, or vicious he may be, has the right to hold the highest office for which he votes, provided his fellow-voters wish to bestow it upon him. Dr. Hammond knows that, in comparison with the number of voters, the number of offices is small, and that only such men are elected to fill those offices as are thought by their fellows to be best fitted to hold them. Dr. Hammond may rest assured that if women are, as he says, so totally incompetent to perform the duties incumbent on any political position, they will never be voted into such position. But if, perchance, some woman should be found more capable of filling such office than any other male or female voter, common justice would require that she be allowed to accept the place.

One more point. The Doctor would lead us to infer, from the tone of his article, that "woman in politics" was an untried problem. While denied the franchise, women have always taken a more or less active share in the politics of all nations, and men

have been very glad to invite and accept their aid in all national or individual political crises. In the French revolutions, in Russia's Nihilism, and in the Irish struggle for independence, women have been active and prominent. In English election canvassing, and in American Congressional lobbying, woman's part is well understood and welcomed by those for whom they work. It is time for woman's political services to be justly recognized, and her full coöperation in politics invited and encouraged, by giving her the right to assert her own individual political preferences through the ballot.

SARA A. UNDERWOOD.

DR. LOZIER.

REVOLUTIONS and reforms make the greatest strides when opposition is fiercest and the true nature of the foe is known. In order to win with fair minds, it is often quite sufficient that the opposition display its weapons and animus; then the case may at once be submitted to the enlightened moral sense of mankind. Error ever encases itself in an armor of sophistries, glittering generalities, and unsupportable assertions, and fancies itself invincible. Now and then a mighty man of valor stalks forth from the camp of the Philistines, clad in triple brass, and challenges the reform host, but Israel is not greatly dismayed. Some simple keeper of a flock among them may cope with this new Goliath of Gath.

And now comes Dr. William A. Hammond, a gentleman high in medical councils, who, in the *NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* for August, declares that the size and quality of woman's brain, and her "neurotic, hysterical" organization, unfit her to choose her rulers, and seriously incapacitate her "to rule others." He weighs her brain and announces that she has too little by several ounces. He shows by medical records that in eighty-one adult brains of both sexes, the ratio between the weight of the brain and that of the body is almost identical, being in man 1 to 36.50, and in woman 1 to 36.46. He then cuts down through the cerebral convolutions, gray cortical substance and sulci, and from the number, configuration, and depth of these infers that women never ought to vote. They should remain the subject class! He might have said, the victim class, for so surely as any class wrongfully rules another class, that class will

be victimized. The argument from superior force is unworthy of this age, and will bring ruin to any nation or home. Perhaps some day a woman anatomist will dissect the brains of several men, and discover wonderful twists in their convolutions, or absence of them, or thickening of the cranial plates or diploë, which, in her estimation, will disprove their ability to vote or to rule. After much tabulating, the Doctor gravely concludes that absolute, and not relative brain-weight, always has governed, and always will and should govern the world. He has proved that the ratio between the weight of body and brain is almost precisely the same in both sexes. He admits that some women have larger and finer brains than some men. If absolute brain-weight is to be the qualification for suffrage, then it follows that only persons of greatest avoirdupois are fitted to rule. The fat men's club hereafter must bear sway.

Admitting all he says, the reason is more urgent that women should vote. Just government is established for the protection of the weak, and they, preëminently, should have a personal voice in it. In a true democracy, the question of sex, size, color, property, education, vocation, or race has nothing to do with the inherent right of each individual citizen to be heard in the choice of his or her rulers. Our Government is not a democracy. It is an androcracy. Men rule. The majority even does not rule, for the census shows that women are in the majority in many States. Notwithstanding man's claim to represent woman, cruel laws oppress her. In this State of New York no wife has a right to her offspring, though for them she may have jeopardized her very life. Her husband can legally snatch them away, even in infancy. Nay, he can will them away before their birth. The only child a mother has a right to is an illegitimate one. If women were legislators, would such laws disgrace our statute books? A woman sits disfranchised while a drunken pauper may vote to so open a road as to confiscate her house. Yet Dr. Hammond coolly says of woman, "Her person and property are as well protected as those of man."

Again: Dr. Hammond thinks that man's front brain, the part that is chiefly concerned in mentality, is longer and larger than woman's. Of course, as the size of the brain is proportioned to that of the body, and as women are generally smaller than men, we should expect this. It proves nothing. The Doctor seems unaware of facts recorded in the annals of surgery, which show

that a portion of this fore-brain may be destroyed and yet the intellect remain unimpaired. We might more reasonably claim that woman's structure appears more complex than man's. Comparative anatomy demonstrates highest complexity as indicating highest type. Conceding evolution and revelation, woman, being last created, represents the highest divine work.

Physiology can never decide morals nor political rights; intelligence might. A million illiterate blacks and foreigners now vote; woman ranks with "minors, idiots, criminals, and Indians untaxed." Perhaps Dr. Hammond would gallantly rescue her from this deep degradation. Craniology establishes no test of ability. A man representing exact science ought to be exact. One fact often upsets many theories. Byron, Gambetta, Emerson, had notably small brains. Some idiots have large brains. According to Broca, an excellent observer, men possessing less than thirty-seven ounces of brain become idiots, while women do not till the weight falls below thirty-two; therefore, woman's brain must be finer. Similarly, the negro's elongated heel and thick cranial bones were thought to prove his unfitness for freedom. If Dr. Hammond finds a vast difference between woman's brain and man's, surely man can never truly represent her. If Dr. Hammond's method should prevail, let all voters and candidates take to the polls accurate tape measures and scales and settle politics mathematically. But this can only be done by knocking out each other's brains, since measurements vary with thickness of skull.

He seriously objects to woman's enfranchisement, because short-haired women and long-haired men and "fanatics," unhappily married, were chiefly its early assertors. Fifty years in reform work convince me that this is entirely incorrect and irrelevant. The world often misrepresents, and sometimes crucifies, its saviors.

But woman is an "emotional" being, and Dr. Hammond's experience as a specialist in nervous diseases has apparently been painful. He says: "To this great preponderance of the emotional over the intellectual nature is due the fact that very few women are capable of an intense degree of abstract thought, no matter how much education they may have received." . . . "No great ideas, no great invention, no great discovery in science or art, no great poetical, dramatic, or musical composition, has ever yet emanated from a woman's brain. There

have been two or three second-rate female painters, and perhaps one first-rate female novelist,—and when that is said, all is said.” We fear the Doctor’s reading has been greatly circumscribed. To Dr. Hammond this statement may seem true, but the reading, thinking world includes more than himself. The great and good women judges and rulers of the ancient and modern world, the women poets, jurists, historians, astronomers, authors, inventors, scientists, artists, physicians, mathematicians, and political economists of this and every age,—an illustrious line, showing that women may be whatever they choose,—he passes by in utter silence. Mrs. Somerville is the one exception he makes by name, and she, he holds, was not essentially great, but was only conspicuous because of being a woman. Such women, he urges, are simply exceptions to the rule; we maintain that they prove what the rule might be for others if they had the opportunity and the encouragement men have had.

Dr. Hammond merits the rebuke of every just mind when he declares woman’s entire inability to tell the truth. We all know that some women are untruthful, and that many men are so habitually. It is quite another thing to say, as Dr. Hammond does, that all womankind is untruthful. “As woman cannot reason abstractly, neither can she reason exactly. She does not, in fact, while having an abhorrence of falsehood, understand the necessity for being exact in the ordinary affairs of every-day life.” . . . “On account of her inability to be exact in regard to her age, the diseases she may have had, her mode of life, and other matters in which exactness is required, life insurance companies decline to issue policies to her. For the like reason, many corporations which loan money will not lend to women, though the security be as good as gold itself.” The gentleman is wholly incorrect. Insurance companies insure women’s lives at slightly advanced rates, because of childbirth risks. I myself was examining surgeon for the New York Globe Mutual for many years. If some institutions refuse loans to women, it is because they cannot deal severely with widows in case of foreclosure and deficiency judgments without incurring public odium.

Perhaps Dr. Hammond’s practice among sick, weak, abnormally emotional and artificially stimulated patients, forming a wealthy *clientèle*, accounts for his view of woman. If he would step out from examining diseased, neurotic, hysterical cases, and observe healthy women, and visit or read reports of Cambridge,

Harvard, Oberlin, Cornell, Michigan University, and other colleges where girls engage in competitive studies—literary, scientific, and mathematical—with boys, often winning the highest prizes, and that, too, with unimpaired health and mental balance, he would not deliberately state that “the female mind experiences overwhelming obstacles in the study of mathematics.” . . . “The attempt to convert a woman into a mathematician is generally very much like making a hare drink brandy and soda.”

The learned Doctor thinks, however, that woman's intuitions are not to be despised. “She will often ‘jump’ at a correct conclusion with a wonderful degree of promptness and accuracy, which reason would reach with slowness and difficulty, if at all. There is nothing of intellectuality about the process, so far as we can perceive.” Astonishing! Well, what is it then? The world could wish that male legislators had a little of this divine intuition at the risk of diminished intellectuality. This is conceding to woman an immense advantage over man.

Finally, the Doctor thinks that while suffrage for woman might be tolerated, her right to hold judicial office, which suffrage implies, would be intolerable and dangerous. This is again contrary to all experience where women have occupied such positions. See reports of the governors and supreme court judges and district attorneys of Wyoming Territory, where women have acted as jurors and justices. Governor Hoyt says of woman suffrage, “Under it, we have better laws, officers, institutions, morals, and a higher social condition than could otherwise exist. Not one of the predicted evils, such as loss of delicacy and disturbance of home relations has followed in its train. After twelve years of happy experience, woman suffrage is rooted and established in the minds and hearts of this people.”

Woman's emotional, “hysterical” organization Dr. Hammond compares to a packet of dynamite, explosive whenever disturbed. “Her likes and dislikes,” he declares, “are paramount with her; the question of right or wrong is a secondary consideration. She will sacrifice her own happiness, her life, and all considerations of duty to others and the public at large, for some man whom she loves, and punish with merciless severity those who, though innocent of crime, have desecrated her ideals, or have otherwise rendered themselves unpleasant to her.” This is the most terrible indictment we have ever seen drawn against the mothers,

wives, sisters, and daughters of mankind. The mind and heart recoil from it, and words utterly fail us in view of its enormity. Are women to be fairly represented, ruled and judged by persons having this estimate of them?

Ethics, logic, and revelation favor the claims of woman. Consequently, many distinguished intellects daily acknowledge their validity. Objections disappear. If "politics is a dirty pool," women will purify it. If Bridget will vote, so does Patrick; the great average will correct incidental evils. If men fail to vote, woman's quicker conscience will enforce the duty. If woman cannot bear arms, many men are also exempt. They substitute sons. If many women are unsuited for office, so are many men. If some women undervalue suffrage, others ought not to be deprived of the franchise. If priestly influence is feared, or union of church and state, woman's enlightened conscience and general intelligence will dispel that apprehension. If rum and venality already threaten the Republic, woman's direct co-operation alone can save it. If the humblest citizen is politically defrauded, all citizenship is jeopardized. If the army and navy may be summoned to enforce the sacred political right of a single male citizen, so should it to enforce woman's. If taxation without representation is tyranny, women are cruelly wronged. If governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, ours is a usurpation.

No reform has made such rapid progress in public estimation as this. A goodly number of women are seeking the professions; others crowd industrial pursuits; multitudes support themselves and their families. They demand a direct voice in legislation and in the national councils. They will surely soon obtain it. Already the United States are outstripped in the race of freedom. In England, 600,000 women, owning real estate or paying rent, exercise the right of municipal suffrage without provoking revolution or social disturbance, and by a recent close vote nearly won the right of suffrage in parliamentary elections. In glancing over the list of the members of Parliament who supported the measure, we find that it contains the names of the foremost statesmen of England. The cause has, at times, nearly triumphed in our own various legislatures and in Congress. Scan the men on each side, and none can fail to discern the inevitable drift of the times toward the speedy enfranchisement of woman. The Republic needs woman suffrage more than women do. Too

long in legislation has the head been divorced from the heart. Women also need the franchise quite as much for their education, personal self-respect, enlargement of view, and activity, as for gaining and maintaining their rights. Responsibility always educates. As woman in the march of the world's reform is last to be elevated, so may she be first in securing for it its final triumph in good government and the establishment of peace and prosperity on earth.

CLEMENCE SOPHIA LOZIER.